

UPPER COLORADO RIVER ENDANGERED FISH RECOVERY PROGRAM  
FINAL DRAFT REPORT EVALUATION

**PEER REVIEWER RESPONSIBILITIES:** Peer reviewers and Biology Committee members are responsible for providing primarily a scientific review of the report. Comments should be submitted electronically via this evaluation form directly to the principal investigator (PI), with a cc: to Biology Committee members and interested parties (see e-mail addresses, below) and the appropriate coordinator in the Program Director's office. If you provide a marked-up draft in addition to your electronic comments, the mark-up only needs to go to the PI. However, please include all substantive comments on this electronically submitted evaluation form, so that those are available to the Biology Committee and Program Director's office. Thank you.

**PEER REVIEWER CHECKLIST:**

\_\_\_\_ I received a copy of the report evaluation form.

\_\_\_\_ I received a copy of the project's most recent approved scope of work.

\_\_\_\_ I have addressed the questions on the report evaluation form.

\_\_\_\_ I am sending comments electronically:

\_\_\_\_ to the PI with copies:

\_\_\_\_ to the appropriate coordinator in Program Director's office, and

\_\_\_\_ Biology Committee members and interested parties:

bdavis@ecoplanaz.com  
burton@wapa.gov  
chuck\_mcada@fws.gov  
ckeleher@cuwcd.com  
davidspeas@utah.gov  
frank\_pfeifer@fws.gov  
gerry\_roehm@fws.gov  
h2orus@waterconsult.com  
hayse@anl.gov  
jhawk@lamar.colostate.edu  
john\_wullschleger@nps.gov  
jshiel@state.wy.us  
kbestgen@cnr.colostate.edu

kelagory@anl.gov  
kevinchristopherson@utah.gov  
Kevin.Gelwicks@wgf.state.wy.us  
matthewandersen@utah.gov  
melissa\_trammell@nps.gov  
michaelhudson@utah.gov  
pat\_nelson@fws.gov  
robert\_muth@fws.gov  
rob\_simmonds@fws.gov  
tchart@uc.usbr.gov  
tim\_modde@fws.gov  
tom.nesler@state.co.us  
tom\_czapla@fws.gov  
angela\_kantola@fws.gov

REPORT TITLE:

AUTHORS:

PROJECT NUMBER:

RATING SUMMARY: (check one)

Accept Accept after minor revision Reconsider after major revision Reject

## GUIDELINES FOR REVIEWERS

The attached report has been submitted to the Recovery Program for acceptance as final. The Program asks your assistance in judging this report's technical merit. Please include in your review both general and specific comments on the report's technical merit, strengths and weaknesses.

### General Comments:

1. Scientific soundness
2. Degree to which conclusions are supported by the data
3. Organization and clarity
4. Cohesiveness of argument
5. Length relative to amount of information
6. Conciseness and writing style

### Specific Comments:

Please support your general comments with specific evidence. Comment on any of the following matters that significantly affected your judgment of the report:

1. Presentation -- Does the report tell a cohesive story? Is a tightly reasoned argument evident throughout? Where does the report wander from this argument? Does the report address the objectives as presented in the scope of work? Do the title, abstract, introduction, and conclusions accurately and consistently reflect the major point(s) of the report? Is the biological significance of the results clearly stated? Are the objectives clearly stated? Is the writing concise, easy to follow, interesting? Are the findings well integrated with existing knowledge?
2. Length -- What portions of the report should be expanded? Condensed? Combined? Deleted?
3. Methods -- Are they appropriate? Current? Described clearly enough so that the work could be repeated by someone else?
4. Data presentation -- Are the results clearly presented? When results are stated in the report, can you verify them easily by examining tables and figures? Are any of the results counterintuitive? Are tables and figures clearly labeled? Well planned? Too complex? Necessary?
5. Statistical design and analyses -- Are they appropriate for the data and correctly applied? Can the reader readily discern which measurements or observations are independent of which other measurements or observations? Are replicates correctly identified? Are significance statements justified?
6. Errors -- Point out any errors in technique, fact, calculation, interpretation, or style.

7. Citations -- Are all (and only) pertinent references cited? Are they provided for all assertions of fact not supported by the data in this report?

8. Recommendations -- Are management implications identified? Are the recommendations technically sound? Are they supported by the results of this and other research? Would implementing the recommendations contribute to recovery?

COMMENTS:

This review will be considered by Recovery Program staff and the Biology Committee. If you desire anonymity, please do not enter your name below. The Recovery Program sincerely appreciates your assistance.

NAME:

DATE:

PLEASE RETURN BY: (PI enters date here)